

Remarks

I. Amendments

Claim 96 is being canceled.

Claim 1, 61, 65, 69-72, 76, 80-82, 87, and 91 – 93 are being amended. Support for the features recited by the claims exists throughout the disclosure, including at least paragraphs 33, 27, and 45 of the published application.

Reexamination of the application and reconsideration of the Final Action are respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

II. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The examiner rejected claims 1, 61, 63, 70-72, 74, 81-83, 85 and 92-96 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Schneider (U.S. Patent No. 6,895,430) in view of Cupps (U.S. Patent No. 5,991,739) and Law in the Outer Limit, O'Donnell.

A. Claims 1, 71 and 82

The combination of Cupps, Schneider and O'Donnell does not teach or suggest the claimed active snippet link:

a corresponding active snippet link to a portion of the corresponding search result document, the corresponding active snippet link including a query-relevant snippet, the query-relevant snippet being text extracted from the portion of the corresponding search result document by the search engine, the corresponding active snippet link including an instruction that causes the client device to navigate directly to the portion of the corresponding search result document from which the query-relevant snippet is extracted when the corresponding active snippet link is selected by a user from the display of the query-relevant snippet of the search result on the client device.

This feature is claimed in each of claims 1, 71 and 82.

i. Schneider

Schneider teaches search result links, but does not teach or suggest a “corresponding active snippet link including an instruction that causes the client device to navigate directly to the portion of the corresponding search result document from which the query-relevant snippet is

extracted when the corresponding active snippet link is selected by a user from the display of the query-relevant snippet of the search result on the client device” as claimed. Instead, Schneider describes HTTP requests for URLs to particular web pages and a URL that generates a WHOIS query for a domain name. This is readily apparent from Fig. 6c of Schneider, which is the HTML source of the page depicted in Fig. 6b.

For the first search result, there are two embedded links:

For the second search result, there are three embedded links:

None of these links teach the claimed active snippet link as claimed.

ii. Cupps

In Cupps, the menu web pages are dynamically created in response to a customer request:

The online ordering machine 106 generates menu web pages 144 that are specific to a particular customer's request. The creation of the menu web pages 144 is done dynamically at runtime in order to provide data that accommodates a customer's request. The creation of the menu web pages 144 in this manner differs from the prior art online order systems. In the prior art online order systems, the menu web pages are preconfigured and displayed upon request. This becomes a burden to maintain and limits scalability. In the present technology, each menu web page 144 is configured at runtime and customized for a particular customer's request. Thus, each menu web page 144 differs since each customer's request is different as is the customer's location.

FIG. 7 illustrates the components used to dynamically generate a menu web page 144. A web page creation procedure 126 is provided that receives as input one or more customer requests and is linked to the order database 128 and the menu file system 146. The web page creation procedure 126 generates a menu web page 144 based on the input received from the user. The data included in the menu web page 144 is retrieved from the order database 128 and the menu file system 146. The order database 128 contains information such as the operational time of a vendor, the restaurant's logo, the categories of the food products served, and the like. The menu file system 146 includes menu data associated with each vendor. The menu file system 146 includes a number of

menu files stored in an encoded binary format for faster retrieval purposes. The web page creation procedure 126 uses the data in the order database 128 and the menu file system 146 to dynamically generate one or more menu web pages 144 that are customized to a customer's request.

See Cupps, col. 8, ll. 43-55 (emphasis added). Thus, Cupps does teach or suggest “the corresponding active snippet link including an instruction that causes the client device to navigate directly to the portion of the corresponding search result document from which the query-relevant snippet is extracted when the corresponding active snippet link is selected by a user from the display of the query-relevant snippet of the search result on the client device” as claimed. Cupps does not “navigate directly to the portion of the corresponding search result document”; instead, a web page is “configured at runtime and customized for a particular customer's request.”

On page 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner states that the relied upon portions of Cupps show “that as Enzo's is extracted from web page of fig. 8 to display to a user in another web page of Fig. 9 by a search engine after a user selection.” This assertion, however, is inconsistent with the express teachings of Cupps cited above, i.e., data for each web page is “retrieved from an order database 128 and the menu file system 146” and “the creation of the menu web pages 144 is done dynamically at runtime.”

Furthermore, taken together, Cupps and Schneider do not teach the claimed instruction for the active snippet link as neither suggests “an instruction that causes the client device to navigate directly to the portion of the corresponding search result document.”

iii. O'Donnell

O'Donnell does not remedy the shortcomings of Cupps and Schneider. O'Donnell only teaches basic HREF linking within a document. For example, the internal document link from the “The Facts” hyperlink to the “The Facts” heading is a basic anchor link, as shown by the following HTML source of O'Donnell:

```
<A NAME=contents></A>  
<H2>  
  Contents  
</H2>
```

```
<BLOCKQUOTE>
  <A HREF="#facts" >The Facts</A>
  <P>
  ...
</BLOCKQUOTE>
<P>
<A HREF="#bibliography" >Bibliography</A>
<HR>
<H2>
  <A NAME="facts">The Facts</A>
</H2>
```

These HTML sources of O'Donnell are conventional HTML source instructions.

However, the Examiner states that O'Donnell teaches "navigating directly to a portion within a document and a document includes link to a top of the search result document." Office Action, page 9. Navigating within a document by means of an anchor link, however, does not teach or suggest a search result that includes an "active snippet link including an instruction that causes the client device to navigate directly to the portion of the corresponding search result document from which the query-relevant snippet is extracted when the corresponding active snippet link is selected by a user from the display of the query-relevant snippet of the search result on the client device" as claimed.

Thus O'Donnell is just as lacking as Cupps and Schneider with respect to the active snippet link as claimed.

B. Claim 93

Claim 93 - 96 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneider in view of Cupps and Hennings et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,763,496). The combination of Cupps, Schneider and Hennings does not teach

a corresponding active snippet link to a portion of the corresponding search result document, the active snippet link containing a query-relevant snippet, the query-relevant snippet being text extracted from the portion of the corresponding search result document by the search engine, the active snippet link being the hyperlink and an artificial anchor appended to the hyperlink and that references the portion for the search result document, the artificial anchor being undefined in the search result document, and wherein the selection of the active snippet link when the search result is displayed on a client device causes the client device to navigate directly to the portion of the corresponding search result document

as claimed.

Cupps and Schneider are applied as above, and Hennings is applied for allegedly teaching “the active snippet link being the hyperlink and an artificial anchor appended to the hyperlink and that references the portion for the search result document, the artificial anchor being undefined in the search result document.”

For the reason set forth above, Cupps and Schneider do not teach “a corresponding active snippet link to a portion of the corresponding search result document, the active snippet link containing a query-relevant snippet, the query-relevant snippet being text extracted from the portion of the corresponding search result document by the search engine....and wherein the selection of the active snippet link when the search result is displayed on a client device causes the client device to navigate directly to the portion of the corresponding search result document.” For at least this reason, the rejection of claim 93 is improper.

Furthermore, the relied upon portions of Hennings do not teach “an artificial anchor appended to the hyperlink and that references the portion for the search result document, the artificial anchor being undefined in the search result document.” There is simply no description or suggestion of an “artificial anchor” that “references the portion for the search result document” and that is “undefined in the search result document.”

C. Dependent Claims

Claims 62, 64, 73, 75, 84 and 86 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneider in view of Cupps and O'Donnell and further in view Hennings (U.S. Patent 6,763,496).

Claims 65-67, 76-78, and 87-89 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneider in view of Cupps et al. and Law in the Outer Limit?, O'Donnell and further in view of Hennings et al. and Caronni et al (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2003/0154221).

Claims 68, 79 and 90 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneider in view of Cupps et al. and Law in the Outer Limit”, O'Donnell and further in view of Hennings et al. and Hill et al. (U.S. Patent Pub. 2004/0024788).

Claims 69, 80 and 91 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneider in view of Cupps and O'Donnell and further in view of Shanny (U.S. Patent No. 2004/0158617).

Each of the remaining dependent claims depend from one of claims 1, 71, 82 or 93. Because each of the independent claims is allowable over the art, each of the dependent claims is likewise allowable.


III. Conclusion

The allowability of all of the pending claims has been addressed. The absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue, or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue, or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment or cancellation of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment or cancellation.

Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06 1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 2/28/11



Paul E. Franz
Reg. No. 45,910

Customer Number 26192
Telephone: (404) 892-5005
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945